

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13, 14, and 16-19 and 21 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-11, 14, 16, 19 and 21 have been amended as shown on pages 2-6 of the Reply. Claims 8, 12, 15, 20 and 22 have been cancelled. No claims have been added and no new matter has been added.

As noted in the Advisory Action dated May 11, 2009 ("May 2009 Advisory Action"), the Examiner has stated that the reply filed April 16, 2009 ("April 2009") reply overcomes: (1) the rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103; and (2) the rejection of claims 10 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The Examiner has allowed each of claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16-19 and 21 (as claims 20 and 22 were cancelled in the April 2009 reply).

In the May 2009 Advisory Action, the Examiner has also stated that, because of the alleged failure of antecedent basis for the phrase "the pre-set vocabulary list," independent claim 11 is not in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the only claim that is pending but not allowed is independent claim 11.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the notification of allowance of claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16-19 and 21. Applicants' representative has amended claim 11 to provide antecedent basis as noted below. Applicants' representative has also minimally amended claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 19 and 21, *sua sponte*, to ensure antecedent basis and/or to further increase the clarity of the features recited.

In view of the amendments herein, it is believed that the present claim set is in condition for allowance.

I. Rejection of Claim 11 Under 35 U.S.C §112, Second Paragraph

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for alleged failure of antecedent basis. In particular, the Patent Office has noted that the phrase "the pre-set vocabulary list" in claim 11 does not have antecedent basis. Independent claim 11 is now amended to recite:

A machine-readable storage medium storing a set of instructions that, when executed by a machine, cause the machine to: model a domain with a plurality of domain models; **determine a presence of a keyword in a document that matches a keyword appearing in a pre-set vocabulary list**; search the document for additional

keywords related to the matching keyword to determine a context for the matching keyword; select at least one domain model to represent the document based on the matching keyword and the determined context, the at least one domain model comprising properties relating to the matching keyword and the determined context; populate the properties of the at least one domain model with values corresponding to properties of the document being represented; and populate at least one domain model property value with a disparate domain model. (Emphasis added).

In view of the amendments herein, Applicants' representative submits that the rejection of independent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for failure of antecedent basis is overcome, and respectfully requests that claim 11 be allowed (along with currently-allowed pending claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16-19 and 21).

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP1836USA].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
TUROC & WATSON, LLP

/ Deidra D. Ritcherson/
Deidra D. Ritcherson
Reg. No. 55,574

TUROC & WATSON, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731